

Chairman Guerrero,

I am writing to you, to express my concerns with HB 5458. I am Executive Vice President of Preston Leasing Corp of Boston and reside in South Windsor, Ct. I also hold the position of Deputy Mayor for the Town of South Windsor and as such, I am very familiar with many Bills that effect municipal government. However, I am writing to you today as a business leader of a leasing company that leases all vehicles on a long-term basis.

As I appreciate the effort being put forth into this Bill with regards to Leasing and Rental Companies, one must not lose sight of the fact that most long-term leases are for more than 60 days. As a matter of fact, most long-term leases are for years and not days. Therefore the language being used in the Bill would not necessarily be a benefit to most leasing companies and as such would force leasing companies to be burdened with another Mandate by the State. Please restructure the language in the bill to qualify ALL Leasing Companies regardless of lease term to allow for such "defense" as Massachusetts does with the toll violators. I would also suggest increasing the grace period from 45 to 60 days to allow for the leasing company to pass on to the Municipality the renter/lessee information.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 860-604-0500.

Thank you for your attention in this matter,

Gary Bazzano
Executive Vice President
Preston leasing Corp

STATEMENT FROM ERL SLAYTON (President, Car And Truck Rental And Leasing Association—"CATRALA" OF CT) on RAISED BILL No. 5458 *AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL AUTOMATED TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT SAFETY DEVICES AT CERTAIN INTERSECTIONS*

Wednesday, March 14, 2012

Dear Chairman Guerrero,

Thank you again for allowing me to submit written testimony on behalf of CATRALA of Connecticut on HR 5458 on March 12th.

My name is Erland Slayton, and I am the president of the Car and Truck Rental and Leasing Association (CATRALA) of Connecticut. Our organization represents vehicle daily rental and leasing companies in Connecticut. Our membership includes large, well-known car rental operators such as Alamo, Avis, Hertz, National, and Enterprise among others, as well as many lesser-known locally owned and operated car dealerships and stand-alone vehicle rental and leasing businesses.

I would like to amend my testimony submitted March 12, 2012 to address some serious concerns our members have raised to me regarding the current language in HR 5458.

Specifically, CATRALA is very concerned with three issues in the current language:

1. The time limit of *for a period of not more than sixty days* is unrealistic and does not properly address companies that lease for more than sixty days—most if not all vehicle leases are written for months and years, not days. We strongly suggest that any such time limitation be removed from the bill entirely.
2. The 45 Day time limit denoted in paragraph (f) to submit payment subsequent to a defense under paragraphs (h) and (i) of the bill is not realistic. Our companies often receive violation tickets from municipalities well outside of the 45 day period following the violation. Even if acted upon as soon as we receive the violation, it is probable that in many cases our members would be charged extra penalties under this language. We strongly suggest that this payment period limitation be removed from the bill entirely.
3. The language addresses "person (s)" who rent or lease vehicles. Quite often the contracted renter or lessee of a vehicle is NOT a person, but actually a "non-person entity" such as a company or organization, where there is no defined "person" driving the vehicle. Besides

passing on information on "persons" to the municipality, we would need to be able to offer a defense against a camera ticket by passing on the information of the "renter/lessee entity" and having the violation transferred to that "renter/lessee entity"--not a distinct person in this case. We strongly suggest the language addressing a defense for rental and lease companies include "non-person renter/lessee entities" such as companies and other organizations.

Without the proper language to address these issues, the bill would not result in its intended consequences, i.e. creating a safer environment for drivers and pedestrians in Connecticut. The current language would allow certain non-person renters/lessees to escape prosecution for their misdeeds and would impose unmerited financial penalties on rental and lease companies.

As mentioned in my previous testimony, our member-companies are operated locally, and employ a great many of your local constituents. Our companies support your efforts to make Connecticut streets and intersections safer. We merely ask that the penalty for disobeying the law go to the proper offending party rather than to our member-companies, who have no real control over our renters' actions once the vehicle is placed in their hands.

Thank you again for allowing me to submit this amendment to my previous testimony.

Sincerely,

Erland H. Slayton

President, CATRALA of Connecticut